

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5, 12-16, 23-25, 27, and 29-30 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 12, 16, 23, and 27 have been amended. Claims 4, 26, and 31 have been canceled.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 since the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein); (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search or consideration (since the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution); (c) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (d) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner rejected claims 12-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner found the term “tangible computer-readable medium” to be indefinite. At the suggestion of the Examiner, Applicants have amended claims 12 and 16 to recite a “tangible computer-readable ***storage*** medium,” thereby obviating the rejection. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph has been overcome.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 102, Anticipation

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5, 12-16, 23-25, 27, and 29-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by *Dono et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 7,237,101). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Without necessarily agreeing with the merits of the Examiner’s rejection, Applicants have amended the rejected independent claims (claims 1, 12, 23, and 27) to incorporate the features of dependent claims 4, 26, and 31, which were found by the Examiner to be allowable in the Final Office Action. Specifically, claims 1, 12, 23 and 27 have been amended to recite “writing a signature ***to a scratchpad register*** in a

configuration space of the peripheral device,” as in claims 4, 26, and 31. Accordingly, claims 4, 26, and 31 themselves have been canceled, as their subject matter has been fully incorporated into the independent claims.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 12, 23, and 27 are patentable over the cited reference. Accordingly, dependent claims 2-3, 5, 13-16, 24-25, and 29-30 are also patentable over the cited reference, at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claims 1, 12, 23, and 27. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 12-16, 23-25, 27, and 29-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 has been overcome.

III. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the prior art of record and is now in condition for immediate allowance.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: September 2, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael R. Nichols/

Michael R. Nichols
Reg. No. 46,959
5100 Eldorado Pkwy., PMB 523
McKinney, TX 75070
Ph: (972) 369-1300
Fax: (469) 519-0144
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS